<div style="border:2px solid black; text-align:center;">

Portal Authority Board of Directors
MINUTES
Portal Authority Board of Directors Monthly Meeting
September 1, 2005
1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Legislative Services Building
200 E. 14th Ave.
Hearing Room A, 1st Floor
Denver, CO

</div>

I.	**Call to Order: 1:45 p.m., Jack Arrowsmith, Vice Chair**
  A.	**Roll Call**

Attendees: Arrowsmith**,** Cadman, Cooke, Feingold, Jenik, Marroney, May, Picanso, Sobanet, Williams, T.

Excused: Groff, Wells

Notes transcribed by Angie Onorofskie, Statewide Internet Portal Authority

Quorum Established

  B.	**Approval of July 7 and August 4, 2005 Minutes**

Vice Chair, Jack Arrowsmith called for any objections to the approval of the July 7, 2005 meeting minutes.

There were no objections to the approval of the July 7, 2005 meeting minutes, and they were approved unanimously.

Vice Chair, Jack Arrowsmith called for any objections to the approval of the August 4, 2005 meeting minutes.

There were no objections to the approval of the August 4, 2005 meeting minutes, and they were approved unanimously.

Discussion:
Senator May requested that action items be listed with the breakdown of current status and action to be taken to ensure that the Board remains on track.

ACTION ITEM: Angie Onorofskie will compile the list of action items and provide a detailed report of the current status and action to be taken.

II.   Annual Meeting

Vice Chair, Jack Arrowsmith stated that according to the SIPA By-laws, the September meeting of each year is considered the Annual Meeting. The By-laws also state that election of officers is to take place at the SIPA Annual Meeting.

A. Recognition of Donetta Davidson

Vice Chair, Jack Arrowsmith stated that Donetta Davidson, the former Chair of the SIPA Board of Directors, has taken a position with the United States Election Assistance Commission. Although SIPA will greatly miss Donetta Davidson, it is a very exciting opportunity. Jack Arrowsmith stated that Donetta Davidson would do a great job, as she has done a great job for the state of Colorado. Vice Chair, Jack Arrowsmith presented a plaque in Donetta's honor, which will be sent to her in Washington, DC. He asked if any other Board members would like to say anything about Donetta Davidson.

Senator Ron May stated that he has known and worked with Donetta Davidson for a long time, and he can't say enough about her. She was instrumental in making immense progress as the Secretary of State and on several technology projects throughout the state.

B. Election of Officers

1. Chair

Michael Cooke stated that the Statute prescribes that the position of Chair of the Board must be an elected official. Therefore, Michael Cooke nominated Representative Bill Cadman to serve as Chair of the SIPA Board.

MOTION: to close nominations for the Chair position and cast ballot for Representative Bill Cadman to serve as Chair of the SIPA Board.

Cooke/ Williams, T.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Representative Bill Cadman will serve as Chair of the SIPA Board of Directors through September 2006.

Jack Arrowsmith presented Representative Cadman with a gavel to begin a tradition that each Chair from now on will also be presented with a gavel.

2. Vice Chair

Rep. Cadman nominated to re-elect the incumbent Vice Chair, Jack Arrowsmith to continue to serve as Vice Chair of the SIPA Board.

MOTION: to close nominations for the Vice Chair position and cast ballot for Jack Arrowsmith to serve as Vice Chair of the SIPA Board.

Cadman/ Cooke

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Jack Arrowsmith will continue to serve as Vice Chair of the SIPA through September 2006.

3. **Secretary**

Michael Cooke nominated to re-elect the incumbent Secretary, Tambor Williams to continue to serve as Secretary of the SIPA Board.

MOTION: to close nominations for the Secretary position and cast ballot for Tambor Williams to serve as Secretary of the SIPA Board.

Cooke/ Jenik

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Tambor Williams will continue to serve as Secretary of the SIPA Board of Directors through September 2006.

4. **Treasurer**

Tambor Williams nominated to re-elect the incumbent Treasurer, Henry Sobanet to continue to serve as Treasurer of the SIPA Board.

MOTION: to close nominations for the Treasurer position and cast ballot for Henry Sobanet to serve as Treasurer of the SIPA Board.

Williams, T./ Marroney

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Henry Sobanet will continue to serve as Treasurer of the SIPA Board of Directors through September 2006.

III. **Update from the Interim CEO, Gregg Rippy**
     A. **Project Prioritization Matrix**
         Gregg Rippy reported that he recently attended a meeting with Colorado Interactive, PMO/IV&V, Bob Feingold (Board member), and Brian Balay (CIO Forum) to discuss the project prioritization matrix. Since it will be the responsibility of the SIPA Board to prioritize applications, the matrix in front of the Board outlines a process that has been used successfully in other states.

Gregg Rippy referred the Board to the red tab in the handout, which provides the outcome of the meetings Colorado Interactive held with the departments in terms of existing applications, desired applications and priority applications. Although Colorado has several existing applications, Colorado Interactive found at least 85 desired applications among the different agencies. Gregg Rippy stated that the Board would need to adopt an objective prioritization process to be given to the agencies so that they know how the process will work.

Rich Olsen, General Manager of Colorado Interactive, stated that the meetings provided a great learning opportunity to understand agency needs. He also stated that both the Executive Director and CIO of each department were invited to the meetings, and about 50 percent of the meetings had both the Executive Director and CIO present. The departments were given a couple of weeks in advance to prepare for the meeting.

At the meetings, Colorado Interactive gave an introductory speech stating who Colorado Interactive is and what they do. Then Colorado Interactive asked of the departments what online applications they already have that should be shared with the public. Colorado Interactive found that most departments had several existing online applications that should at least have a link on the portal. Colorado Interactive also asked the departments what services they would like to have online and how they would prioritize those desired applications.

Gregg Rippy referred the Board to the yellow tab in the handout, which described the process of queue management.

Gregg Rippy then referred the Board to the blue tab, which represents the priority applications being considered. Applications highlighted in yellow represent enterprise wide solutions.

B. E-Government Services Project Prioritization

Gregg Rippy also presented the Board with a document entitled *E-Government Services Project Prioritization*. The document describes how to score the possible development and offering of an e-government service in alignment with the value of the service and the resources available for the project. The three entities (SIPA, Colorado Interactive and SysTest) would score the applications (not weighed) based upon value and resource items. The raw score would be relative to other applications being considered, as these items would fall under the self-funded model.

Gregg Rippy explained that an additional queue might represent an agency that has its own money to fund a certain application. In this case, Colorado Interactive would determine additional resources needed, which could move an application outside of the Annual Business Plan (IABP).

Gregg Rippy explained that a third queue might represent applications utilizing SIPA funds. These items would be desired by the SIPA Board or could potentially create a political win, and these applications would be driven by a task order.

In summary, Gregg Rippy outlined three separate prioritization queues:
1. Integrator's Annual Business Plan (IABP) – self-funded model
2. Agency funded applications
3. SIPA funds – task order items

Gregg Rippy stated that this process is sensitive to the fact that Board members simply do not have time to score each application, but the Board could approve or disapprove the outcome of the scoring.

Discussion:
John Picanso clarified that the scoring includes the SIPA Executive Director and staff, SysTest, and Colorado Interactive. He then stated that Colorado Interactive plays a very important role in the process because Colorado Interactive and department resources would have to be determined.

John Picanso then asked who would oversee the mini-enterprise or cross-agency applications.

Gregg Rippy stated that Colorado Interactive would oversee these because they would want to make sure that they are not developing more than one of the same applications. Gregg Rippy also stated that the CIO Forum would be very involved in helping to avoid duplicating efforts.

John Picanso stated that OIT and IMC see several potential portal applications.

Gregg Rippy stated that it would be important to explore all opportunities to aggregate applications.

Henry Sobanet asked why the PMO/IV&V was involved in the scoring process, as it would add a significant expense.

Gregg Rippy stated that the role of SysTest operating as a PMO would provide having someone familiar with day-to-day operations. He stated that there is a functional need for this role regardless of where you put the cost. The role could be covered either with SysTest or by hiring additional SIPA employees. If the Board decided to utilize SysTest for this role, it would be outlined in a task order.

Senator May stated that the IMC evaluates projects brought forward with no real prioritization. Then they are sent to OSPB to determine priority in terms of

budget. If a department asks for an IT project greater than $25,000 it must go through the IMC.

Gregg Rippy stated that this would not be necessary in all instances, as most of the portal applications would not cost the agency anything.

Gregg Rippy stated that the reason for having at least three entities involved in the scoring process (SIPA, Colorado Interactive and SysTest) is that the process might be somewhat driven by Colorado Interactive wanting to create a profit. Gregg Rippy stated that the most conservative way to score would be having several eyes on the process. Gregg Rippy asked the Board if this is a process that can work if details such as reviewers can be re-evaluated.

Michael Cooke asked the appropriateness of paying SyTest Labs to help with this process. She stated that agency directors would be very involved in the process, and she believes that might be enough.

Henry Sobanet stated that this might be more of a resource question, and the issue almost calls for a policy in the area of prioritization.

Jack Arrowsmith asked Gregg Rippy if the same tool would be used with local government entities.

Gregg Rippy answered yes. Local and state government entities must use the same criteria when utilizing the self-funded model.

Jack Arrowsmith suggested possibly assigning this to process a committee.

Bob Feingold stated that this project prioritization simply establishes a business process. State government has a very well known process, and the portal must be consistent with that. Bob Feingold also stated that deliberation within state government would require state resources such as time. Discussion will need to occur regarding SIPA staff to potentially be responsible for the scoring after there is a feasible, flexible process in place.   Then the Board can simply provide oversight. Bob Feingold also stated that the Board would hamstring the Executive Director if they were too involved.

Michael Cooke stated that she agrees that the Board's role is to provide oversight. Michael Cooke offered to have the Business Committee work with Gregg Rippy and Colorado Interactive to finalize the prioritization document.

Gregg Rippy added that application prioritization is a living process. The IABP will be ready soon. He also stated that his fear is when Colorado Interactive submits the IABP that the Board will ask why certain items are included. The prioritization document will help to clarify questions.

Senator May suggested using the application prioritization process as a sub-queue if there is going to be state money involved. The governor could then make the final decision.

Gregg Rippy stated that a bill might come through representing another application queue. He also stated that there is really no reason to score if funding and resources are already set for a certain application, as those applications fall outside of the self-funded model.

Jack Arrowsmith stated that the Board should both adopt the process and agree to modify as necessary, or the Board should decide not to adopt the process and have the Business Committee revise the document.

MOTION: to refer prioritization to the Business Committee and revisit the issue at the next meeting.

Cooke/ Marroney

Discussion:
Senator May asked how long implementation would be delayed if the process is delayed for another month.

Gregg Rippy stated that it shouldn't delay or stop work at all. He stated that we could go forward with the work and change the prioritization process as necessary.

Greg Jenik stated that the Board should trust its own decisions made to this point. Colorado Interactive brings experience to Colorado. The document probably needs to be revised , but we should move forward for the time being.

Gregg Rippy stated that some of the applications would be "no brainers" even without a score.

MOTION: to refer the prioritization document to the Business Committee and revisit it at the next meeting, while at the same time not delaying moving forward.

Cooke/ Marroney

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

IV.   **Committee Reports**

A. Business Committee, Michael Cooke

Michael Cooke reported that the Business Committee has a new project, which is to review the proposed project prioritization matrix submitted by Colorado Interactive.

B. Contracts Committee, Gregg Rippy

Gregg Rippy stated that the committee has been working with the Department of Revenue to get an appropriate EGE agreement. Having Colorado Interactive as a signature on the EGE brings forth new rules and requirements. Therefore, in order to move forward, the EGE will only be signed by SIPA and the Agency and there will be a note in the Annual Business Plan (IABP) stating that nobody can move forward without the approval of Colorado Interactive. Everyone should understand the process, but it will make a much cleaner agreement.

Discussion:

Jack Arrowsmith asked Gregg Rippy if he was looking for action or if it was an informational statement.

Gregg Rippy stated that he would like for the Board to vote.

MOTION: that the EGE agreement would have only two signature lines, one for SIPA and one for the agency.

Cooke/ Sobanet

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Finance Committee, Henry Sobanet

Henry Sobanet stated that the committee is trying to connect with Gregg Rippy to set up a comprehensive meeting to determine a reasonable pro-forma. There was also a meeting with SIPA, Colorado Interactive, Treasury and the State Controller to discuss revenues from the portal and whether or not they will be affected by TABOR, as SIPA does not want to discourage agencies from accepting credit cards through a payment engine. A financial report will be available soon.

D. Personnel Committee, Rep. Cadman

Rep. Cadman stated that the five candidates for the Exeutive Director Position have been posted to the SIPA website. The Personnel Committee will meet today after the regular business meeting to conduct three of the five interviews. The last two interviews will take place September 7, 2005. The Board of Directors will then hold an open meeting on September 14, 2005 at 1:30 p.m., and the Personnel Committee will recommend one candidate for the position.

Discussion:

Senator May asked if other business could be conducted during the meeting since Board members would be congregated anyway.

Vice Chair, Jack Arrowsmith stated that that would be fine if it would be helpful to the Board.

Gregg Rippy suggested that the Board take another look at the prioritization matrix at that meeting.

V. Old Business

No discussion.

VI. New Business
A. Colorado Interactive Update - Rich Olsen, General Manager

Rich Olsen stated that the prioritization matrix represents a lot of work. Colorado Interactive has been working on building trust and rapport with agencies, and they have been very successful in doing so. The process has helped to develop the IABP, and it has helped Colorado Interactive to familiarize with Colorado state government. He stated that once something is in Tier 1 (green), it would be ready to go. All documentation is ready, and it is very self-sorting. Departments have a myriad of things going on that can change the timing of projects. This prioritization document simply serves as a fallback for the Board, which would be necessary to use with competing projects.

Rich Olsen added the following regarding the matrix:
The green tab outlines agencies desire for Colorado.gov templates (look and feel) and a content management system. Colorado Interactive found that most agencies liked the idea of using a content management system.

The blue tab outlines portal priority applications by tier, and the yellow items represent enterprise solutions such as: user provisioning, payment engine, tax portal and online store.

Gregg Rippy clarified that content management is a request of the Board outside of the IABP, which would require a task order.

Greg Jenik asked if local government was involved, and what the plan was to include them in the process.

Rich Olsen referred the Board to the second to last page of the red tab section, which shows local government input. Local government is very important, and the IABP says that local presence should always be in the queue. There are several enterprise-wide solutions that could be used for cities and counties. Rich Olsen stated that in addition to meeting with Douglas County they have also met

with the City and County of Denver. Colorado Interactive's plan is to reach out to metro cities and counties first to talk about pulling local entities together in order to "build once use many".

B. SysTest Update – Dan Wenger, Program Manager

Dan Wenger reported that the PMO/IV&V Monthly Status Report (August) was submitted and posted to the eRoom.

During the month of August the team completed the following deliverables:
- Change Management Process Review
- 60-Day Deliverables Review of the Annual Business Plan (IABP)
- PMO/IV&V Weekly Status Reports
- PMO/IV&V Monthly Status Report (August)

The team will soon begin work on the following:
- 90-Day Deliverables Review of the Annual Business Plan (IABP)
- 120-Day Deliverables Review of the Annual Business Plan (IABP)

Discussion:
Jack Arrowsmith thanked SysTest Labs for the Weekly and Monthly Status Reports. He stated that they are very thorough and helpful.

VII.   Agenda Items for Next Meeting
- Personnel Committee will recommend a candidate for the Executive Director position.
- Re-visit the Application Prioritization Matrix.
- EGE Agreements

Next meeting is scheduled for:
Wednesday, September 14, 2005
1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Legislative Services Building
200 E. 14th Ave.
Hearing Room A, 1st Floor
Denver, CO

VIII.   Adjournment

Vice Chair Jack Arrowsmith called for a motion to adjourn the September 1, 2005 Annual Meeting of the SIPA Board of Directors.

MOTION: to adjourn the September 1, 2005 Annual Meeting of the SIPA Board of Directors.

Jenik/ Sobanet

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.